APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/157,018	09/18/1998	BENJAMIN KILGORE	MS-80	1865

27662   7590   12/04/2002

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800
OXNARD, CA   93036

EXAMINER
LUU, SY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
  be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
  communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

1)☒   Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 September 2002_ .

2a)☒   This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐   This action is non-final.

3)☐   Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒   Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐   Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒   Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are rejected.

7)☐   Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐   Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐   The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐   The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐   The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐   The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐   Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:

         1.☐ received.

         2.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____ .

         3.☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐   Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   20)☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the Amendment E, filed 09/24/02.

2.   Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 13, 18 and 32 are independent

claims. In the Amendment E, claims 1, 2, 13 and 18 were amended, and claims 19-34 were

added. This action is made Final.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.   Claims 1-4, 6-21, 23, 26-27 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Maritzen et al. ("Maritzen", US # 5,870,719).

As per independent claims 1, 10, 14, and 26-27 Maritzen teaches a method for

dynamically displaying data values on a client computer (fig. 2; *client 220*), comprising:

receiving transmitted results, sub-items associated with the results, and rules of

enforcement of sub-item combinations in a predefined format through a communications

interface in response to a request from the client; and processing the results in real time using the

client computer in response to user adjustment of the results and the sub-item configuration on

the client computer; displaying a first set of results, and dynamically displaying the processed

results on a client display device; a control module stored on the server, wherein the control

module is transmitted from the server to a remote client in response to a request by the client;

wherein the adjustable interface option displayed on the client is adapted to communicate with

the control module, and wherein the control module facilitates the adjustment by the remote

client of the associated criteria confined within the transmitted rules of enforcement that causes

the dynamic output to change in real time (figs. 2-3 and 5; col. 7, lines 39-50); and wherein the

communications interface is the Internet (col. 2 lines 13-15).

Maritzen does not explicitly disclose the method to comprise: preventing a user from

creating and encountering sub-item conflicts using the transmitted rules of enforcement, the rules

of enforcement for sub-item combination to be processed in the background, and the rules for

selection and combination of the associated options automatically prevent user selection or

combination of incompatible or conflicting options.   However, these step would have been

inherent to a method such as Maritzen so as to allow the system to process transmitted results

transparently to users and display sub-items in combination logically and properly, especially

when they are <u>mutually exclusive</u> of each other.

Independent claims 2, 13, 18 and 32 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, in that

all claims involve: a client requesting for data values to be transmitted from a server (fig. 2;

server 240) performing a database query; and specific dynamic output results derived from the

data values as a result of user adjustments in real time via an user interface in the client. Claim

13 further indicates that the data values are <u>pricing data</u> (*price lists and quote*). Claims 2, 13, 18

and 32 are therefore rejected under similar rationale as claim 1.

As per claims 3-4, Maritzen further discloses the adjustable interface tools to comprise

input boxes for adjusting criteria of associated criteria in real time as well as the interface tools

being controls in a dialog box (fig. 5).

As per claim 6, Maritzen discloses the GUI to have at least one graphical control for

allowing the user to dynamically adjust the results and associated sub-items (fig. 5; *e.g. radio*

buttons and check boxes).

As per claim 7, Maritzen teaches the data values to comprise pricing data for at least one

object, and the associated sub-items comprise user selectable options for the objects (fig. 5; *price*

list and quote etc.).

As per claims 8-9 and 15, Maritzen teaches the interface tools to include: at least one

previously selected sub-items are automatically deselected when a user selects a new sub-item

which conflicts with the at least one previously selected sub-items; at least one additional sub-

items to be automatically selected when a user selects a sub-item which requires selection of the

at least one additional sub-items; and the pricing data and associated options are dynamically

updated and displayed on the client display device in response to user interaction with the pricing data and associated options (fig. 5; col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 24; *deselection of an item occurs inherently when another sub-item of the same option is selected, e.g. if sub-item "S10" under option "Products" is currently selected, it would be deselected if sub-item "S4/20" is subsequently selected*).

As per claim 11, Maritzen teaches remote processing of the results and associated sub-items to continue in response to user interaction with the results and associated sub-items on the client display device after the communications interface between the server and the client has been terminated (col. 7, lines 52-60)

As per claim 12, Maritzen teaches the GUI to have at least one graphical control for allowing the user to dynamically adjust the displayed data and sub-items (fig. 5; *e.g. radio buttons and check boxes*).

Claims 16-17 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, Maritzen teaches the steps of receiving and using a transmitted control module to process the results in real time (fig. 5).

Claims 20-21, 23 and 31 are similar in scope to claims 6-7, 8 and 15 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 33-34 are similar in scope to claim 19, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   Claims 5, 22, 24-25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Maritzen et al. ("Maritzen", US # 5,870,719).

As per claim 5, Maritzen does not explicitly disclose the interface tools to include

dynamically coupled check boxes so that designated check boxes dynamically change as a user

configures conflicting interface tools constrained by the logical rules of enforcement. Official

Notice is given that this feature is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an

artisan at the time of the invention to include this feature in Maritzen's interface tools in order to

aid and visually facilitate user interaction with a constrained set of decision variables.

As per claims 22, 24 and 28-30, Maritzen does not explicitly disclose: (a) a warning

message to be automatically displayed when a user selects a sub-item which conflicts with at

least one of the sub-items already selected by the user, and a message to be automatically

displayed on the client display prompting the user to select between conflicting sub-items when

the user selects a sub-item that conflicts with a previously selected sub-item; and (b)the interface

tools to include: input boxes that are dynamically coupled such that the input boxes dynamically

change as a user adjust the associated criteria; display markers as indicia of potential sub-item

conflicts; and dynamically activated dialog boxes for displaying potential sub-item conflicts,

providing suggestions to resolve the conflicts and providing user interaction to resolve the

conflicts.   However, Official Notice is taken that these expected features are well known in the

art and would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to be included in the

interface tools of Maritzen in order to aid and visually facilitate user interaction with a

constrained set of decision variables.

As per claim 25, although Maritzen teaches the control module to remotely process the results and associated sub-items in response to user adjustment of the results and sub-items in the through the use of Java Applets to provide real time interactivity (figs. 2 and 5), Maritzen does not disclose the remote processing to be accomplished after the communications interface between the server and the client has been terminated. However, Official Notice is given that the use of a GUI through Java Applets to obtain <u>complete</u> user input information remotely is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to further include a complete set of possible results as part of the transmitted data via the Java Applets as used by Maritzen in accordance to the user's initial request from the client to the server. Transmitting the Java Applets comprising of <u>all</u> required data for completing a user's request would allow Maritzen's method with real time processing which eliminates the need to establish further communications between the client and the server. By limiting client/server interactions, improvements in reducing bandwidth requirements as well as reducing data latency would have been achieved.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-18 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that: Maritzen et al. do not prevent a user from creating and encountering sub-item conflicts using rules of enforcement transmitted from a server to a client, and these conflicts must be validated as conflicts by accessing the server; this is in contrast to

Applicant's disclosure on page 20, lines 4-7 of the Specification that the transmitted rules of enforcement of sub-item combination contain "all potential configurable conflicts between sub-items to thereby prevent the user from creating any sub-item conflicts during adjustment of the sub-items."

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons: (a) while the Applicant asserts that the transmitted must contain all potential configurable conflicts, the claim language does not contain such definite limitation; and (b) by providing various mutually exclusive options such as those sub-items choices under "Products" (S10, S4/20 and 54/50) or "Marketing Service" (drop list including choice "none") in figure 5, wherein only one sub-item could be selected and the remaining sub-items under the same option would be prevented from selection and thus prevented from being in conflicts, the disclosure of Maritzen et al. clearly meets the requirement of "preventing a user from creating and encountering sub-item conflicts using the transmitted rules of enforcement" as recited or similarly recited in the independent claims.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Geller et al. (US 5,844,554) teaches methods and systems for user interfaces and constraint handling configurations.

Henson (US 6,167,383) teaches a method for providing customer configured machines at an internet site.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is **(703) 305-0409**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Sy D. Luu
Patent Examiner
November 25, 2002